

### REMARKS

Presently, Claims 1-8, 19, and 20 are rejected. By this paper, Applicant amends Claims 1, 19, and 20 and adds new Claims 25 and 26. Support for Claims 1, 19, 20, and 25-26 can be found throughout the specification, including, for example, paragraphs 36, 53-57, 70-73, and 77-83. Accordingly, Claims 1-8, 19, 20, and 25-26 are presented for consideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the following arguments.

#### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed at non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner asserts that Claims 1-8 are not positively tied to a particular machine that accomplishes the claimed method steps nor transforms the underlying subject matter, and therefore do not qualify as a statutory process. Applicant respectfully asserts that amended Claim 1, which recites, “determining within a central device of a local area network a content category of an Internet site that a user is accessing,” is directed at statutory subject matter.

Additionally, Claims 2-8 depend directly or indirectly from Claim 1 and thus include statutory subject matter to the same extent as Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection to Claims 1-8.

#### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-8 and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,987,611 (“Freund”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,801,747 (“Bedard”) and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,486,892 (“Stern”).

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must establish that the prior art reference (or references when combined) render all of the claim limitations obvious: “All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” (*In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (CCPA 1970); *see also M.P.E.P. § 2143.03*.) Further, the Examiner must clearly articulate reasons why the claimed invention would have been obvious, with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness, and taking into consideration how a person of ordinary skill would have understood the prior art teachings. (M.P.E.P. § 2141). Finally, even if a *prima facie* case of obviousness is

established, this can be rebutted by showing that the art, in any material respect, teaches away from the claimed invention. M.P.E.P. §2144.05 (III), citing *In re Geisler*, 116 F.3d 1465, 1471 (Fed. Cir. 1997). For example, it is well-established that “it is improper to combine references where the references teach away from their combination.” (MPEP 2145(x)(D)(Emphasis added); See *In re Grasselli*, 713 F.2d 731, 743, 218 USPQ 769, 779 (Fed. Cir. 1983)). As discussed in further detail below, the combination of Freund and Bedard do not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

#### Independent Claims 1 and 19

A *prima facie* case of obvious cannot be supported for Claims 1 and 19 as Freund, Bedard, and Stern fail to disclose all of the elements of these claims and as Freud explicitly teaches away from a combination as recited in these claims. Amended Claims 1 and 19, respectively, recite, “determining within a central device of a local area network a content category” and “means that when executed by the central device determines a content category of an Internet site.” In contrast to these features recited in Claims 1 and 19 and as previously recognized by the Examiner, Freund discloses client based monitoring and filtering. Specifically, Freund states, “the present invention provides a system and methods for client-based monitoring and filtering of access.” See Freund Column 12 Lines 45-48. Freund further states, “in accordance with the present invention, a central filter is not employed.” (Emphasis added). See Freund Column 12 Lines 48-49. Similarly, both Bedard and Stern disclose implementations that amount to client-based filtering. See Bedard Column 3, lines 4-8 and Column 8, Lines 2-6; and Stern Column 4, lines 63-65 (“system 1 is shown to consist of a client 2 on which the guide software application (Guide) 3 resides”). As Freund, Bedard, and Stern all disclose client-based filtering, they do not disclose “determining within a central device of a local area network a content category” or “means that when executed by the central device determines a content category of an Internet site” as recited in Claims 1 and 19 respectively, and therefore cannot support a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Freund, Bedard, and Stern additionally fail to support a case of *prima facie* obviousness as Freund teaches away from the recited limitations. Speaking of such techniques, Freund states, “such an approach is problematic” because “the centralized nature of firewalls and proxy servers . . . extracts significant performance penalties.” See Freund, Column 2, Lines 41-44. For

example “a single server might have to do the filtering work for hundreds or even thousands of PCs or workstations.” See Freund, Column 2, Lines 44-46. This set-up “represents a major bottleneck to overall system performance . . . even when client PCs are idly awaiting data.” See Freund, Column 2, Lines 46-49. Freund further teaches away from features as recited in Claims 1 and 19 as it states that “centralized filter architectures are missing vital information to correctly interpret the data packets because the underlying protocols were designed for effective data transfer and not for data monitoring and interception.” See Freund, Column 2, Lines 59-64. As Freund teaches that the features recited in Claims 1 and 19 are “problematic,” extract “significant performance penalties,” create “major bottleneck[s] to overall system performance,” and “are missing vital information to correctly interpret the data packets,” Freund cannot be properly combined with another reference to render obvious all of the features recited in Claims 1 and 19.

As neither Freund, Bedard, nor Stern teach “determining within a central device of a local area network a content category” and “means that when executed by the central device determines a content category of an Internet site,” and as Freund teaches away from such a combination, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be supported by Freund, Bedard, or Stern, individually or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to Claims 1 and 19.

#### Dependent Claims

Claims 2-8, 20, and 25-26 depend directly or indirectly on, and thus incorporate all features of, either Claims 1 or 19. By this dependency, Claims 2-8, 20, and 25-26 are patentable over Freund, Bedard, and Stern to the same extent as Claims 1 and 19. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections Claims 2-8, 20, and 25-26.

### **CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action are inapplicable to the present claims. Accordingly, early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is most earnestly solicited.

Any remarks in support of patentability of one claim should not be imputed to any other claim, even if similar terminology is used. Additionally, any remarks referring to only a portion of a claim should not be understood to base patentability on solely that portion; rather, patentability must rest on each claim taken as a whole. Applicant respectfully traverses each of

the Examiner's rejections and each of the Examiner's assertions regarding what the prior art discloses or teaches, even if not expressly discussed herein. Although changes to the claims have been made, no acquiescence or estoppel is or should be implied thereby; such amendments are made only to expedite prosecution of the present application and are without prejudice to the presentation or assertion, in the future, of claims relating to the same or similar subject matter.

Applicant has not presented all arguments concerning whether the applied references can be properly combined in view of the clearly missing elements noted above, and Applicant reserves the right to later contest whether a proper reason exists to combine these references and to submit evidence relating to secondary considerations supporting the non-obviousness of the methods recited by the pending claims.

The undersigned has made a good faith effort to respond to all of the rejections in the case and to place the claims in condition for immediate allowance. Nevertheless, if any undeveloped issues remain or if any issues require clarification, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call Applicant's attorney in order to resolve such issue promptly.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: June 23, 2010

By: 

James F. Herkenhoff  
Registration No. 51,241  
Attorney of Record  
Customer No. 20,995  
(619) 235-8550